



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

After an interval of thirty years we have the *editio altera* of LUCIAN MÜLLER'S standard work, *De Re Metrica Poetarum Latinorum praeter Plautum et Terentium* (Petersburg and Leipzig, Ricker). Needless to say, like Matho's litter, it is *plena ipso*. We have not to do, as he himself tells us, with a convenient manual for ingenuous youth. This want is supposed to be supplied by the smaller book, which has recently been translated into English by an American professor. 'Neque vero,' he says (p. 114), 'enchiridia aut centimetros puorum in usum perscribimus sed libero ingressu ut quaeque digna memoria et frequentia arte Latina evenere exponimus.' It is a leisurely book and written for leisurely men. It is a book made for a land of long winter nights, of bubbling samovars and cigarettes without end. We expect and we find a *vita senis*, an autobiography which is not confined to the space between the lines in the body of the book, but is adumbrated in the 'Greeting to the Reader'; and not the least characteristic passage is one in which the memory of Bonn and its discords tells on the concord of Lucian Müller's grammar. 'Ibi invenimus,' he remarks, 'professorem quendam, qui cum confuso ingenio esset et conmoto, hoc tamen clare perspexit et acute, *gravem* admodum sibi *nos* fore et *incommodum*, si Bonnae maneremus.' And when, in opposition to Usener and to Bergk, he rejects the theory of the gradual evolution of the hexameter, and says 'Omnia perfecta ex se nascuntur,' is it going too far to suppose that he is thinking of himself? 'Lucianus Müllerus videtur mihi ex se natus,' with apologies to Tiberius and Rufus.

But it were perhaps better to pass over so important a work in silence than to make flippant mention of it, and it is much to be hoped that the *De Re Metrica* will find a competent reviewer in the pages of this Journal. Still, the reappearance of the book calls up a problem, or rather a series of problems, which the teacher of youth cannot shirk. What is to be done with the spiritual side of antique metres? Are we to content ourselves with giving the mere schemes of the metres and say nothing of their character? English scholars, as we have seen, are capable of publishing the Greek dramatists without so much as a *conspectus metrorum*, but even those who do not go so far as this in the way of abnegation are shy, perhaps justly shy, of calling attention to the moral and aesthetic effect of the various rhythms employed by the classic authors. The question is one of very pressing importance when we take up Horace. The variety of measures in the first book of the Odes is emphasized by Horatian scholars. Lucian Müller has a chapter on it. Now, shall we call this a conscious display of metrical versatility, and that alone? Or are we to attach the same ethical character to an Alcaic or Sapphic strophe in Latin as to an Alcaic or Sapphic strophe in Greek? Professor TYRRELL, in his delightful book on *Latin Poetry*, maintains that the Odes are little more than experiments in the Greek lyric metres, and I must confess that to a

Grecian the thesis is tempting; and yet in a recent volume of the *Revue de Philologie* (see A. J. P. XVI 256), M. RENÉ PICHON maintains that 'in determining and observing the ethos of the different metres Horace shows himself an artist in the true sense of the word.' Professor SMITH, in his well-balanced edition of the *Odes of Horace* (Ginn)—one of the most thoughtful and serviceable editions we have had of late years—calls attention to the 'similarity of character and identity of metre' in the first six odes of the third book, whereas Mr. Gladstone, in the preface to his translation, says that Horace in most cases 'employed the same metre for odes the most widely divergent in subject and character.' To be sure, he adds that 'Horace knew the capacity of his respective metres and how far he could make them elastic for particular varieties of use.' But it is very much to be feared that the 'elasticity' of the Alcaic and Sapphic is a fancy. The *Carmen Saeculare* is more Greek in its structure simply because it was intended to be sung, and the dreadful mechanical caesura is no longer insisted on. There is very great danger in seeing especial beauty in this or that metrical effect. Those who remember CHASE's *Horace* will doubtless recall that editor's renderings of Nauck's fancies on this subject, and Chase's pupil, Professor SMITH, with whose sobriety no one will quarrel, forgets himself so far as to emphasize the rhythm of Od. III 3, 35. 36:

adscribi quietis
ordinibus patiar deorum.

'The beautiful rhythm,' he says, 'enhances the impression of serene existence which the words convey.' Unfortunately, the beautiful rhythm is word-foot for word-foot the same as in the preceding verse:

pugnacis Achivos
Hectoreis opibus refringit.

Indeed, it seems to be hardly safe to look for symbolism in any measure that Horace has subdued to familiar use, and the odes that are the most interesting from the ethical side are precisely those that are clearly translated from the Greek—the odes that are composed in the rarer metres. So there can be no question about the ethos of the solitary Ionic poem (III 12). So the greater Asclepiadeans are all translations, and all carry with them in their triple *syncopé* and *toné* a moralizing cadence, a note of protest. Those who come after us, however, will in all likelihood find this explanation of the tone of remonstrance as fanciful as Nauck's remarks on the 'steady march of the weighty choriamb,' and send the lyric logaoedi to keep company with the dramatic logaoedi.¹ Still, whatever these choriambes are, they are not 'weighty,' and there can hardly be any mistake about the logaoedic movement. At all events, the effect of 'tu ne quaesieris,' of 'ac ne quis modici transiliat munera Liberi,' and 'quae mens est hodie, cur eadem non puero fuit?' is the same as that of Catullus's solitary experiment in the same metre (XXX): 'Iam te nil miseret, dure, tui dulcis amicali?' By the way, it is a

¹ Glyconeos quoniam Sophocles et Euripides et Aristophanes et in luctu et in risu et ad gravissima et ad levissima adhibuerunt paene eosdem, ἤθος non innatum habere sed a musica arte accepisse consentaneum est.—v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Commentariolum Metricum*, II.

pity that the name Asclepiadean has been fastened to a metre which comes so distinctly out of the heart of lyric life, the metre of the fragment of Sappho (68 Bgk.) which Swinburne makes so prominent in his *Anactoria*.

Another solitary experiment is the famous sixteenth epode—doubtless after the Greek—in which the hexameter contrasts with the pure iambic as poetic dream with prosaic reality. ‘In form,’ says Professor SMITH, ‘as well as in poetic sentiment the epode is among the most perfect pieces that Horace has left us.’ In form, doubtless. As to the ‘glow of youthful enthusiasm and patriotic fervor,’ that is another matter; but the symbolism is transparent, and it seems strange that Nauck or any one should have said that this ‘combination of hexameter and pure iambic senarius has a stately harmony suited to grave, earnest thoughts and passing no less easily into a flow of happy aspirations.’ The combination of heroic hexameter and iambic trimeter is apparently very old, and from the beginning bears the character of cruel contrast, which, of course, is heightened by keeping the iambus pure. Among the solitary experiments of Catullus is the movement—which one may dare call the ignoble movement—of the iambic tetrameter catalectic (XXV):

Remitte pallium mihi meum quod involasti.

Here too the *ethos* is undisputed, but it may be not superfluous, in view of the neglect of such things in school editions, to emphasize the delightful use which Aristophanes makes of this metre in the *Knights*. Kleon is an heroic rascal, and evidently feels himself degraded by the necessity of fighting Agorakritos with his own weapons; but he cannot do otherwise, and the debate begun by Agorakritos in iambic tetrameter (v. 335) is necessarily kept up in the same; but when Kleon sets the pace (v. 763) he strikes out in the grand anapaestic tetrameter. But the chorus mischievously forces the controversy back into the iambic strain (835), and we see how Kleon is again compelled to occupy the same unheroic level with his antagonist. At the close Agorakritos rises with the chorus to anapaestic heights. Kleon’s fate is to dwell in indecencies forever, and his curse is to ply the same trade as Agorakritos had plied—iambic tetrameter and all.

οὐδὲν μέγ’ ἄλλ’ ἢ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξει τέχνην.

In a very recent Halle dissertation, *Quaestiones de elocutione Demosthenica*, BRUNO KAISER, under *φημί* *ὅτι* (p. 12), goes somewhat out of his way to rebuke Rutherford for saying (Babrius, p. 221) that *φημί* *ὅτι* does not belong to Attic Greek, Xenophon being always excepted. This was in 1883, not 1873, as Kaiser says. In my Justin Martyr (1877) I was more cautious—perhaps too cautious (Apol. I 33, 35): ‘*φημί* is seldom used with *ὅτι* in the best period; at every turn in later Greek.’ So common is it in later Greek that the free use of it became a regular sign-manual, and Rutherford is right in warning against it; but Rutherford is not always to be trusted, for in the same place he has made an unnecessary ado about *εἰπεῖν* with inf., as I have shown repeatedly and conclusively. Comp. Just. Mart. Apol. I 12, 32; A. J. P. IV 88, VI 489, and elsewhere; see also Humphreys, *Antig.* 647. But *φησὶν* *ὅτι* or

even *ὥς* is a different thing. Passages sometimes cited are not satisfactory. A real exception with *ὥς* is Lys. 7, 19, of which more presently; but Plat. Crito, 52 B *ὅτι* is the 'quotation-mark *ὅτι*' (Spieker in A. J. P. V 224) and hardly counts, and Gorg. 487 D *ὅτι γε οἷος παρρησιάζεσθαι καὶ μὴ αἰσχύνεσθαι αὐτός τε φῆς κτέ.*, the *ὅτι* clause precedes and is not directly dependent. It is like a Latin *quod* clause. Now comes Dr. KAISER with a string of passages from Demosthenes, and a triumphant air, but of his examples of *ὅτι* D. 16, 20 *ταυτὰ ὅτι* is not in point. It is a 'namely' clause. In 19, 88 *τί τις εἶναι τοῦτο φῆ πλὴν ὅτι*, it is clear that *ὅτι* does not depend on *φῆ*, which has its normal inf. in *εἶναι*. In 20, 135 *ὅτι—ἐστὶ* is printed by Bekker as a separate sentence, and it is in any case a *quod* clause, and *φῆσαι* is to be translated 'say yes.' In 22, 23 *ὅτι* does not follow *φῆ* immediately, but we first have the inf. and then in a subsequent sentence *ὅτι*, and so the construction may be put down as a slight anacoluthon. *ὥς* (4, 48) is likewise an anacoluthon, and the same is true of 27, 19. It is, therefore, not yet time to lift the taboo of *φημί ὅτι*. Why *φημί* takes the inf. so naturally and *εἶπον* takes *ὅτι*, I have at least suggested in A. J. P. IV 88; cf. 531.

In his recent excellent edition of *Eight Orations of Lysias* (Boston, Ginn), Professor MORGAN does not fail to notice the anomalous construction *φησὶν ὥς* (7, 19), to which reference has been made already, nor does he fail to tell us that Goodwin (MT. 753, 2) comments on its rarity and that Weidner ejects *ὅς φησεν*, to the effacement of the lonely example. But when he comes to *εἰ μὴ διὰ* (12, 60) he evidently finds no comfort in Goodwin's curt paragraph (MT. 476, 3), and so he falls back on Frohberger's ellipsis of *ἦν*, which the German scholar thinks less arbitrary than the ellipsis of *ἐκωλύθησαν*. They are both arbitrary, and both belong to a bygone age of forced explanations. The ellipsis is not *ἦν*, is not a form of *κωλύω*: it is simply the negative involved in the leading clause. This matter received a passing mention in a review of JEBB'S *Selections from the Attic Orators* (A. J. P. X 124), and would not have been taken up again if I had not found, on examination, that there is no adequate explanation of the idiom in any of the standard grammars. Commenting on Isocr. 5, 92 *φαίνονται κάκεῖνοι κράτησαντες ἂν τῶν βασιλέως πραγμάτων, εἰ μὴ διὰ Κῦρον*, JEBB, too fine a scholar to explain the phrase by *ἐκωλύθησαν*, says 'sc. ἐσφάλησαν,' and refers to Goodwin, from whom no help is to be got. The true ellipsis is *εἰ μὴ οὐκ ἐκράτησαν* 'if they had not failed to get the mastery, thanks to Cyrus,' *οὐκ ἐκράτησαν* being equivalent to *ἐσφάλησαν*. Many of the commentators content themselves with a lazy reference to Poppo on Thuk. II 18, who cites the English 'but for' and refers us to Matthiae, §580, where we find nothing except a translation. Others send us to Stallbaum on Gorgias 516 E *εἰ μὴ διὰ τὸν πρύτανιν, ἐνέπεσεν ἄν*, where Stallbaum suggests the ellipsis of a verb of hindering. Koch renders the Platonic passage: 'Wenn nicht unter Einwirkung des Prytanen, die Sache vor sich ging, wenn nicht der Prytan es gehindert hätte.' 'Unter Einwirkung des Prytanen' is not a good translation of *διὰ τὸν πρύτανιν* and 'die Sache vor sich ging' seems to be inspired by Frohberger. Welche Sache? *τὸ μὴ ἐμπεσεῖν*? It is pleasant, under these circumstances, to recall that an American scholar, Dr. Woolsey,

in commenting on the Platonic passage had the courage to say: 'The origin of the idiom is not very clear.' That is much better than dodging the question by a mere translation, much better than following the exploded method of arbitrary ellipsis. In the Lysianic passage: ἀπολέσαι παρεσκευάζοντο (= ἀπολεῖν ἐμελλον = ἀπώλεσαν ἂν¹) εἰ μὴ δὲ ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς, the words to be supplied are οὐκ ἀπώλεσαν, εἰ μὴ οὐκ ἀπώλεσαν meaning 'unless they had failed to destroy,' and the same explanation applies to all the other passages commonly cited: Th. II 18, Dem. 19, 74. 90; 23, 180. Of course, no such lumbering ellipsis was present to the Greek mind. So εἰ δὲ μὴ has become simply 'otherwise,' and εἰ μὴ διὰ has become 'but for.' We ourselves do not stop to think what 'it' stands for, in 'if it had not been for,' and yet analysis has its rights and the origin of phrases must be sought.

It is eminently fit that the 'double head' of Macmillan & Co.'s *Parnassus Library* should first be crowned by Homer and Vergil, the *Iliad* being edited by Mr. WALTER LEAF, the *Vergil* by Mr. T. E. PAGE. The editors and their principles of criticism are sufficiently well known, and the interest in these two beautiful volumes is largely typographical. The *Vergil* is printed in type of an 'old style' face, the *Iliad* appears in Macmillan's 'new Greeks'—a fount described and illustrated by W. G. RUTHERFORD in the *Classical Review* for March, 1894. The ideal is the papyrus character squared, and there cannot be two opinions about its great beauty. In his preface Mr. LEAF half-apologizes for doing away with the ugly ι -subscript, but everybody is or ought to be ready for that. The ι -subscript has no decent warrant, and scholars have long rebelled against it in their hearts, and sometimes even in practice, as witness Professor F. D. ALLEN's article on 'The Prometheus and the Caucasus,' in this *Journal*, XIII 51-61. Whether the omnipotent schoolboy will submit to the new type, despite its beauty, is another matter, and it is very much to be feared that the resemblance of the line to the embroidery on his sister's sampler—a point which has been urged in its favor—will hardly be considered a recommendation by the majority of boys, who usually learn Greek just at the time when they are most in rebellion against anything that seems 'missy.' But the Messrs. Macmillan have not hesitated to carry the experiment into the schoolboy domain, and so we have received at the same time with the text edition of the *Iliad* the *School Iliad*, of which the first twelve books have appeared, under the editorship of Messrs. LEAF and BAYFIELD. The text is in the new Greeks, but the notes, with the exception of the catchwords, show the old characters, which look thin and hungrily by the side of Mr. Image's calligraphy. The notes of this school-book are based upon Mr. LEAF's excellent edition and his *Companion to the Iliad*. Of the three 'invaluable' works which Mr. BAYFIELD has drawn on for his *Grammatical Introduction*, any one who has really worked in this field will be surprised to find Kühner's grammar called an 'inexhaustible treasury of examples,' whereas it does not suffice for the most modest demands of an explorer. Delbrück's

¹ Good illustrations are not to be despised, even when they come from post-classic authors. Dio Chrys. XI 332 R οὐκ ἂν ἐφρόντισαν ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ἐφήδεσθαι ἐμελλον αὐτῶ.

theory of the subjunctive and optative is discarded as old and outworn, and Goodwin's, which coincides very closely with Delbrück's own modification, reigns in its stead. For my own part I have never got much comfort out of a 'more vivid' and 'less vivid,' 'nearer' and 'more remote' future, and it is by no means proved that the path to the modal through the future is any more certain than the path to the future through the modal; nor am I prepared to recognize any special novelty in Mr. BAYFIELD'S treatment of *ἄν* and *κεν*, which he brings forward with evident confidence of 'general acceptance.' But the last subject has been treated at some length in this Journal, III 449, and, at any rate, these are not matters to be discussed at the close of a 'Brief Mention' article of the parapleromatic order.